

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/700,803 First Named Applicant: Basu
Examiner: G. Gauthier Art Unit: 2614 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Richard Lyon, Reg. No. 37,385 (2) Examiner G. Gauthier
(3) (4)

Proposed Date of Interview: 5/5/08 Proposed Time: 2:00PM (EDT) (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rejection (102)	1-41	Nelson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

(See Attached Agenda)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.


(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

AGENDA FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW FOR S/N 10/700,803

1) The 102 Rejection of Claims 1-41 over Nelson.

I propose amending Claim 1 to recite, “displaying a menu listing a plurality of potential responses on the display of the communication device, said responses being employed by the user to communicate with the remote party; and displaying at least one additional menu on the display of the communication device upon selection of a response from a currently displayed menu, which together with the original menu form a hierarchy of menus used to construct a complete statement when selected responses from each menu displayed are played back in the sequence they were selected; and upon selection of ~~one of the~~ two or more responses used to construct said complete statement by the user employing the user interface of the communication device, accessing a pre-recorded voice snippets corresponding to the selected responses, and transmitting a playback of the accessed voice snippets to the remote party over the communication link”. The added language is for the most part from Claim 2, which would be cancelled. Similar language would also be included in independent Claims 29 and 38. Claim 41 would be cancelled.

Nelson does not teach the foregoing statement construction feature. Granted, the Examiner contends in the Office Action that Nelson teaches this feature at Col. 7, lines 30-47 (in the context of Claim 2). This portion of the Nelson reference reads:

“A user views a conversation representation as illustrated by block 35 in FIG. 3, and makes selections about utterances which are to be voiced over the telephone. In an embodiment, **conversation representation 31 may be icons having text labels** as illustrated in FIG. 7. **A Conversation Element 33a associated with conversation representation 31 is stored in an utterance data store 33, that when selected are retrieved and submitted to an audio generator 34 to produce the output signals needed for the telephone connection.** An audio-to-phone connector 35 provides this electrical connection. A telephone-to-user connector 30 allows the user to hear both the conversation generated by the system and other users. In an embodiment, a telephone-to-user connector is an earpiece. A switchable (switch 37) audio input 36 allows a user to voice directly into a telephone when appropriate. A stored data extractor 32 converts data stored in other formats (e.g., PC calendar entries, address books) into a format suitable for audio generation”. (*emphasis added*)

Clearly, Nelson is teaching a scheme where audio is generated and transmitted for each selection made by a user. This is not the claimed statement construction feature that has the advantage of allowing a user to build statements using a set of hierarchical menus. When such a statement is built, only then are the multiple selected responses (two or more) forming the statement accessed and transmitted as audio.

As such, it is believed the proposed changes to the claims overcome the cited rejections.